

a core;  
a plurality of gluing vias located on each of at least two sides of the at least one recording track; and  
an adhesive inserted into said core and said plurality of gluing vias.

CB  
CX  
Add Claim 28. The magnetic head of Claim 27, wherein said plurality of gluing vias are in contact with, and extend from, said core.

---

### REMARKS

In an Office Action dated October 6, 1999, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 19 and 20. Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 6, and added Claims 21-28 herewith. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following.

#### Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that Claims 1, 6 and 19 fail to clearly indicate how many individual heads are involved, and where the gluing vias are located relative to the head(s). Applicants traverse as follows.

Claim 1 recites a "magnetic head"; Claim 6 recites a "magnetic tape head"; Claim 19 recites a "magnetic head". Applicants are unclear how the claim is indefinite for failing to indicate how many individual heads are involved. Further clarification is respectfully requested.

As to the location of the gluing vias, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the gluing vias are formed between the substrate and closure and interspersed amongst the plurality of recording tracks. Claim 6 recites that a plurality of gluing vias are formed between the substrate and closure. Claim 19 depends upon Claim 1. Hence, the location of the gluing vias is clearly recited in Claims 1, 6 and 19.

#### Claim Rejection - Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 19 and 20 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over Claims 1-10 of U.S. patent 5,943,196. Applicants believe this rejection to be in error, as the present application is a divisional of a parent patent application 08/846,864 that issued into U.S. patent 5,943,196. Further clarification is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsutaki (U.S. patent 5,022,140). Applicants traverse as follows.

With respect to independent Claims 1, 6 and 19, such claims recite a thin film layer deposited on a substrate, the thin film layer comprising a plurality of recording tracks thereon. The cited reference does not teach or suggest any type of thin film layer comprising a plurality of recording tracks thereon. Hence, Claims 1, 6 and 19 are not anticipated by the cited reference.

Nor would there be any motivation to modify the cited reference in accordance with the claimed invention, as the cited reference teaches use of a different, mechanical coil technology for flux induction to the head (Col. 4, lines 19-24). Using such coil technology, there would be no reason to include a plurality of recording tracks.

Applicants traverse the rejection of dependant Claims 3-5, 8-10 and 20 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claims 1, 6 and 19.


**Newly Added Claims 21-26**

Claims 21-26 have been added herewith. Examination is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant has overcome all basis in the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 19 and 20. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of such claims be withdrawn, that all pending claims be allowed, and that this case pass to issue. Should a phone conference be deemed by the Examiner to help expedite issuance of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed phone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
YI-SHUNG CHAUG

By:   
Wayne P. Bailey  
Registration No. 34,289  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: December 15, 1999  
STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION  
One StorageTek Drive, MS-4309  
Louisville, Colorado 80028-4309  
(303) 673-8223